

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 59-105 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 2/5/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-24, 31-44, 48-50 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Medwick et al. (US 2002/0176988) in view of

Medwick et al. teaches a process for providing temporary protection for a substrate for handling. The substrate (14, support) is coated with a functional coating i.e curable material (14) and an interleaving material (16, protective film) which is not in contact with the curable material by using a blocking layer, and winding the support to produce a gap between the support and the curable material. The functional film can be cured by convective air flow (see 0041).

Medwick et al. fails to teach that a continuous gap is provided for gas or liquid to flow through freely as required by **claim 1**.

However, Tadashi et al. discloses a process for heat treating a film which is rolled. The process comprises forming a gap between the film using spacers in order to

Art Unit: 1792

apply the heated air to flow through film to create a good quality film with uniform heat treatment without deformation, blocking or scratching (see objective, claims). The film is applied on a plastic support such as polyethylene terephthalate, etc (see page 4 of constitution and actions section) and a functional film is provided such as a transparent electrically conductive film, photo selective film, etc which is formed by vapor deposition, sputtering, etc.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the spacers provided by Tadashi et al. in the process of Medwick in order to provide a space for when the film (functional film) is cured the hot air can pass through resulting in a film that is heat treated (cured) uniformly especially since both references are directed to coated a polymeric substrate with a functional film followed by curing where the film is wound around a support.

The substrate can be flexible [0023] such as a polyethyleneterephthalate as required by **claims 3-5**.

The substrate can be polyimide or polyethylene (see page 4 of Tadashi) as required by **claims 8, 10 and 11**.

The thickness of the glass is in the range of **claims 12-13** (see 0023).

In regards to **claims 15 and 16**,

Tadashi teaches where the support is previously wound onto a core.

The functional coating may be which modifies one or more physical properties of the substrate such as optical, thermal, chemical or mechanical and is not intended to be

removed from the substrate during additional processing [0024]. The coating can be an electrically conductive coating [0025] as required by **claims 17 and 22**.

In regards to **claims 18-21**,

The Medwich et al. reference gives a general listing of possible functional layers. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to use the claimed type of functional layers depending on the desired final product. The coating can made of silver as required by **claims 23-24**.The film can be a barrier layer [0026] as required by claim 30. The layer can be cured using heat, air flow, uv light or infrared light [0041] as required by **claim 33-38**. The interleaving material is a strip applied at along edges of the support (see Figures of Tadashi et al.) as required by **claims 42 and 43**.The protective layer (interleaving layer) can be a flexible material [0032] as required by **claim 44**. The thickness of the spacer is 0.1 – 1.5 mm as which overlaps the range in **claims 48-49**. The spacer material is a tape therefore having an adhesive backing as required by **claim 50**. The functional material is cured as required by **claim 56**. The air flow is 0.05 m/sec - 1 m/sec which is within the range of **claims 58**.

4. Claims 25-30, 45-47 and 51-55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1792

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CACHET I. SELLMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0691. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1792

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cachet I Sellman
Examiner
Art Unit 1792

/C. I. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/William Phillip Fletcher III/
for Timothy H. Meeks, SPE of Art Unit 1792/1700